

list as a list revised by the judge, then my honourable friends do not accept. There is just that difference of opinion, and it seems to be irreconcilable. It is a regrettable fact that such is the case; but the Government must necessarily be influenced by the law officers of the Crown as to what machinery is necessary to put into effect the requirements of the proposition which we yesterday discussed. That has been submitted, and it has not been accepted.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: I hope I shall be allowed to say this: that the draft which I have read as being our proposition was left in the hands of the Secretary of State and Mr. O'Connor, with the understanding that it would be amended so as to harmonize with the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: But that cannot be carried out.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: And that embodied the principle which was agreed on. I would be glad to have an explanation.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: I was present at the conference which took place between representatives from both sides of this House and representatives from both sides of the House of Commons. The honourable member for De Salaberry, so far as he has gone, has frankly and fairly stated what took place; but the honourable gentleman has, I am sure not intentionally, omitted one thing which I consider of great importance in the discussion. After the discussion had proceeded all afternoon, and I think far into the evening, the Secretary of State, (Hon. Mr. Meighen), came into the meeting and read the memorandum which has first been read by the honourable member for De Salaberry. As soon as he read it he said that the proposition could not be worked out in the language which was embodied in that agreement. In other words, he said, "This memorandum is quite unworkable." After we discussed it for some time further, the Secretary of State said, "Now we are agreed upon the settlement of this question, and I wish to state"—

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Agreed upon the principle.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: Upon the principle, if you choose, on which this question is to be settled—I think that is accurate—"and I shall state what we are agreed upon." He then went over the memorandum, not reading it, but summarizing it, and said: "Now, we shall carry this out on the plan laid down for the

cities of Ontario; we shall adopt the machinery which is to be used in settling the lists in the province of Ontario." I confess that, so far as I am concerned, I had not read that part of the Franchise Act which related to the cities of the province of Ontario. No person in the meeting demurred to the statement made by the Secretary of State, and we left the meeting on the understanding that Mr. O'Connor should draft an amendment to the Franchise Act providing for our adopting the machinery which is to be used in settling the lists in the province of Ontario. Now when one reads the clause of the Franchise Act applicable to the cities of the province of Ontario, which is subsection 3 of section 65A, one sees at once that the enumerator has to make the list, striking out the names which should be stricken from the lists, and adding names which should be added to it. Therefore if the Secretary of State's suggestion, which was agreed to by all those present—I am not saying that it was thoroughly understood—is to be followed, it necessarily follows that paragraph 2 of the proposed amendment is really the amendment which was agreed to at that meeting.

I believe that all parties to the conference are expressing themselves candidly, and I do not consider that the honourable member for De Salaberry is making a statement which is not as he understood it; but I think it was the duty of those who were at the conference, if they did not know what were the provisions for the settlement of the electoral lists for the cities of the province of Ontario, to look at those provisions. At all events, it would have been the part of prudence to have done so. I was not concerned to look at the provisions, because what would satisfy the Secretary of State and the members from Nova Scotia was absolutely satisfactory to me, and I had no concern in the matter in any way excepting to endeavour so far as I could to bring those interested to an agreement.

I conceive that the only difference between us is this, under the proposed amendment the duty is thrust upon the enumerator of striking from the voters' list such names as he by evidence finds should not have been put on that list when it was finally revised, and of adding to that list the names of those whom he finds on evidence were improperly left off the list when it was finally revised. I am not addressing myself to the question of the women's vote, or the question of striking at the aliens.